DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 478 SO 013 009

AUTHOR McGee, Peece
TITLE Practical Problems of Mass Instruction--A Personal Memorandum.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 14p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (New York, NY, August, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education: *Large Group Instruction: Problems: *Sociology

ABSTRACT

The author discusses the vices, virtues, and problems of mass instruction in college sociology. His observations are based on personal experience. A "mass" class is defined as one with an enrollment exceeding 250 students who meet together as a class at least part of the time. Sociologists generally believe that mass classes are not a good form of instruction, but use them because they are a cost effective means of dealing with large enrollment courses and because they concentrate the burden of lower division teaching on one or a few instructors. The perceived vices of mass instruction are well known: student anonymity and social distance from instructor, reduced motivation to learn, and the tendency to focus instruction on the lowest cognitive levels. The practical problems of mass instruction can be classified under three headings: problems of scale: problems of space, equipment, organization, and time: and personal problems of and for the instructor. A number of specific examples of problems in each category are discussed. Perhaps the most persistent and difficult problem for the instructor is that a significant number of students will always perceive the quality of instruction in the mass class as inadequate. The principal reason that mass teaching is problematic is the lack of an appropriate theoretical model for doing it. All educational models for instruction are based on the assumption that a class is a social group which interacts on the basis of reciprocal normative expectations. The mass class, however, is an audience, i.e., a collective behavioral phenomenon, not a group. Thus theater might offer a better model for defining its instruction, but this possibility has not been explored. The paper closes with sets of observations and advice about mass teaching directed to departments that use or consider it. (Author/PM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195478

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Reece McGee; Jude Ruckel
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRACTICAL PROBLEMS OF MASS INSTRUCTION - A PERSONAL MEMORANDUM

by

Reece McGee
Purdue University

SP 013 009

Paper presented at the annual meeting,
American Sociological Association,
Section on Undergraduate Education.
New York, August 1980.

ABSTRACT

Practical Problems of Mass Instruction -
A Personal Memorandum

by

Reece McGee, Purdue University

In the absence of a body of scholarly literature on mass instruction, a form long-used in sociology and perhaps somewhat on the increase at this time, this paper summarizes the most salient elements of the author's long personal experience with it. The vices of mass teaching are known: student anonymity and social distance from instructor, reduced motivation to learn, and the tendency to focus instruction on the lowest cognitive levels. Two of its three virtues are less appreciated, however. The three are the possibility of staffing the largest enrollment courses with the best and most experienced teachers, of systematic training of graduate students for teaching, and cost-effectiveness.

The practical problems of mass instruction can be classified under three headings: (1) problems of scale; (2) problems of space, equipment, organization, and time; (3) personal problems of and for the instructor. All are in one sense problems or consequences of scale. A number of specific examples of problems in each category are discussed. Perhaps the most persistent and difficult problem for the instructor is that, for reasons explained, a significant number of students will always perceive the quality of instruction in the mass class as inadequate.

The principal reason that mass teaching is problematic is the lack of an appropriate theoretical model for doing it. All educational models for instruction are based in the assumption that a class is a social group which interacts on the basis of reciprocal normative expectations. The mass class, however, is an audience, i.e., a collective behavioral phenomenon, not a group. Thus theater might offer a better model for defining its instruction, but this possibliity has not been explored.

The paper closes with sets of observations and advices about mass teaching directed to departments that use or consider it, and to individuals who may be asked to do it.

INTRODUCTION

The very large or "mass" class has been utilized in sociology for a long time. It has been popular at universities as a means of "handling" the introductory course, with its typically very large enrollments and is now, in time of financial stress, beginning to invade the smaller institutions as well. It is also common in social problems and marriage courses, the two other sociological curricula that typically have high enrollments, and may be found occasionally in other courses too. As far as I can ascertain from review of the literature and personal inquiry, sociologists generally believe that mass classes are not a good form of instruction, but use them anyway because they are cost-efficient means of dealing with large enrollment courses and because they compress or concentrate the burden of lower division teaching on one or a few instructors. They are typically offered in the lecture-discussion format, with two or three lectures a week to a mass audience which is then broken down once weekly into small discussion sections led by graduate teaching assistants. Equally typically, they are given to junior faculty members to "manage."

I define a "mass" class here as one with an enrollment exceeding two-hundred fifty students who meet together as a class group at least part of the time. One could argue that any class exceeding one hundred enrollments, or even seventy-five, is, in effect, a mass class, and indeed classes of such size share some of the characteristics of larger ones. I shall limit my remarks here, however, to very large classes because they have special problems of their own and because they are rarely discussed in detail in the literature on teaching. The basis of this discussion is my own teaching position in which I have been responsible for an introductory course enrolling around one thousand students per semester for the past 26 semesters. I believe that experience to be a unique one in the history of American sociology, but I would call upon the research literature in the area if there were one. In its absence, this report must be understood as experiential rather than empirical.[1]

VICES AND VIRTUES OF MASS INSTRUCTION

The perceived vices of mass instruction are well known and most of what we believe about it is true: students do experience a painful sense of anonymity in such courses; if the necessarily bureaucratic structuring of the instruction and course management is autocratically administered, considerable frustration may be engendered as well. There is a great and largely insurmountable social distance introduced between instructor and student and certainly it is impossible for the teacher to "get to know" more than a handful in any semester. Under these circumstances, student motivation to achieve is unlikely to be much affected by the instructor, course content, or format. The self-starters perform well anyway, and the educationally inadequate or self-destructive are hastened to their fate, but the middle-group whose performance is likely to be significantly affected by their relationship to the instructor will probably not put forth the quality of effort of which they are capable under other circumstances. Finally, mass classes encourage instruction aimed at the lower levels of cognition and mitigate against the kind of socratic, discussion-based, problem-targeted teaching that produces the higher.[2] No one who has ever taught a mass class is likely to argue with any of these charges.

But is is also true that the mass class has certain generally unrecognized virtues or at least offers the possibility of manifesting them. Two of these seem to me to be paramount. First, a mass class format permits large numbers of students to achieve their first--and what for most will be their only--exposure to sociology from an experienced senior teacher if the department staffs the course that way. The vast majority of the students in our introductory classes never take a second course in the field. But although they will leave the college or university to become citizens and voters and elected officers of government, we typically shape their understanding of what our discipline is and does through mediation through its least practised and least experienced members. The mass introductory course can offer a platform for the best and most experienced. It would be the course of political wisdom to take advantage of it.

A second generally unrecognized and unpractised virtue is that in the conventional lecture/discussion format, the mass class permits graduate students to obtain their first classroom teaching experience under the guidance and tutelage of an experienced instructor with whom they are involved in a common enterprise and to whose best interests it can be to insure that they are well guided. The mass format, in other words, offers the department an unparalleled opportunity to train its graduate students to teach. That few departments do so is unfortunate, but in no way reduces the virtues of the opportunity the format offers.

Finally, of course, as is generally recognized, the mass class is cost-efficient. For example, I now teach my own two thousand student per year class in a "straight-lecture" format without discussion sections and with the assistance of three graduate assistant tutors and a part-time undergraduate administrative assistant for an annual salary cost of approximately $46,500. Utilizing discussion sections of 20 students each and assigning four such sections to each assistant would require 12½ TAs. With my own salary and that of the administrative assistant, this would require an annual outlay of about $79,750. If the same number of students were taught by seven assistant professors at $15,000 apiece, each teaching four independent classes of 35 students, the annual cost would be $105,000. The respective cost-per-student of each of the three formats is $23.25, $39.88, and $52.50. This is not to suggest that the kind or quality of instruction would be unaffected by such differences in teaching structure, but only to document the cost-efficiency of mass instruction. (However we may feel about instructional quality, no one who has ever had to prepare or administer a departmental budget can afford to ignore instructional costs.)

PRACTICAL PROBLEMS OF MASS INSTRUCTION

The practical (as opposed to qualitative) problems of mass instruction seem to me classifiable under three categorical labels. We can usefully see them as comprising problems of scale; problems of space, equipment, organization, and time; and personal problems for and of the instructor. Many of the substantive issues involved are deeply confounded with one another, and in one sense, all are problems of scale--the sheer numbers of students involved in mass classes and the constraints that such numbers impose.

Problems of Scale

What I call here problems of scale occur because in the mass class the orders of magnitude with which the instructor must deal are so much greater than those of the usual class that the differences, while merely quantitative, become differences in kind. To illustrate:

Every instructor is familiar with what are usually called "problem students:" those with inadequate intellectual background for college level work who nonetheless manage to matriculate; with emotional difficulties so severe, or lives so chaotic, that their ability to function as students is impaired; and the larger, less definable group, who may simply be called "personally disorganized"--who forget the date of the test, lose their books or assignments, can't find library material, overlook an entire page of reading assignments, read the wrong book, and so forth. The experienced teacher expects to find a few such students in almost any class although their numbers are diminished by attrition in upper division courses. We all develop strategies for dealing with them, from remedial class structuring to brutal evolutionary selection. ("Oh, you thought the test was tommorow night? Too bad, you get an "F.") A few years ago, when considering the problem that such students pose for mass instruction, I guesstimated on the basis of experience that their proportions in my classes averaged as follows: psychotic, 2½ percent; functionally illiterate at the college level, 12 percent; and personally disorganized, 8 percent. (Interestingly enough, Paul Baker, who teaches mass classes at Illinois State University, has derived very similar guesstimates.) The concept of problems of scale in mass class teaching is dramatically illustrated for this example by the following table.

Number of "Problem Students"

Type	class size 35	class size 1000
psychotic (2.5%)	.9	25
illiterate (12%)	4.2	120
personally disorganized (8%)	2.8	80
total	7.9	225

As any instructor will readily appreciate, while the proportions of such students in the class remain the same, the problem of dealing with them is radically different in the mass class as a sheer consequence of number. Eight problem students in a class of thirty-five are an annoyance, but require little actual adjustment or extra effort. Two-hundred and twenty-five of them, no matter how large the mass in which they are immersed, are a problem of another order entirely, and much of the instructor's time and energy are expended upon them. Indeed, if one is not careful, one begins to define all students as problematic and starts structuring the entire course around means of dealing with them. (In the mass class, the problem cases are likely to constitute a large fraction of the students with whom the instructor actually interacts on a face to face level: the non-problematic do not come to one's attention and are must less likely to come to see one personally.)

Problems of Space, Equipment, Organization, and Time

Space. Problems of space for mass classes occur in two dimensions: availability and quality. On my own large campus, there are eight classrooms that will seat two-hundred-fifty people but none that will accommodate my two five-hundred-person sections. There are, however, two rooms that seat almost five-hundred, so I am able to begin each term with students seated on the floor and in the aisles confident that attrition and normal absences will soon permit the room to seat the class. There are some auditoria that seat five hundred, but university regulations prohibit them from being used for classroom purposes. From what I know of other campuses, this situation is typical: rooms for mass classes are few and the only spaces available for very large numbers were not designed as classrooms.

Two other aspects of space availability need to be remarked. One is the requirement of small classrooms for discussion sections if the mass class uses that format. In my own case, with such sections limited to enrollments of twenty, the course required fifty sections meeting once weekly. By spreading the sections over the last days of the week and their hours across the clock, the actual number of different rooms required is much reduced, of course, but involves a major problem for the university's schedule office since a room used once at, say, three p.m. on Friday, cannot be scheduled for that hour on Monday or Wednesday either, as a rule.

Finally, there is the matter of space for examination. If the mass class utilizes a common exam, which instructors often find it expedient to do for practical reasons, adequate examination space becomes a major problem. By preparing two different examinations, each in double format, I could test my classes in the same rooms in which I lecture, but students would be seated elbow-to-elbow with all of the problems that entails. Multiple exams at the same time in different rooms involve serious coordination problems and much manpower. I am enabled to get around the problem on my own campus by utilizing an immense music hall in which I can space out my entire class at once, but no matter how the situation is resolved, careful planning, coordination and scheduling is required.

The qualitative dimension of the space problem is probably even more pressing. Of the two very large classrooms I use, only one was designed as a lecture hall, and that some time ago. Its acoustics are not good, and its basic design with regard to matters of ingress and egress, lighting, display, and so forth, is primitive. It is nonetheless, better than the other, which was designed as a biology demonstration room keyed to suspended TV monitors. I do not know how well it functions for that purpose; as a lecture hall, it could have been worse designed only by having the floor flat instead of pitched. It is possible to design good lecture halls for large numbers of students, but they are very expensive and should never be built without careful consultation with teachers of mass classes. The problems of acoustics and access are paramount, although film and TV projection needs to be carefully assessed as well. The problem of scale appears here, too. The basic design of a two-hundred fifty seat classroom is not completely adaptable to five hundred seats; technical visual, auditory, and projection problems occur at that scale that can only be resolved by experts.

Equipment, Organization and Time. It would be easy to devote an entire essay solely to these problems of the mass class; I will attempt merely to indicate them here. The equipment of the classroom has important consequences for the facilitation or limitation of what is possible in the mass situation. The chalkboard, for example, that ever-present crutch on which so many of us depend so heavily, is unuseable in the mass situation; the people at the rear cannot read anything less than a foot high and, if you write that large, the board holds little. Thus one turns of necessity to the overhead and opaque projector and the placement of these is critical. (If you are on a stage, the machine usually has to be below in order to form an image adequately large; further, it often obscures the view of those in the front rows, and how do you get to it?) If you use slides, placement of that projector is also critical. The written handout, the slide, and the transparency, are adequate substitutes for the chalkboard; they involve costs and prior preparation, however. Voice amplification is also essential, so one is either constrained in movement by a microphone cord or subject to the vagaries of the cordless microphone. I have found it useful to have an AV technician in attendance at most of my classes; this involves a direct cost to the departmental budget. If one cannot have a technician, it is a good idea to learn to run the machinery, including the movie and television projector, oneself.

Problems of organization are numerous and critical. Are you in the habit of putting readings on reserve? It is impossible for the mass class. Too many copies are required, librarians are overwhelmed by hundreds of students all demanding the same thing at once, and it is difficult to supply written substitutes without violating the copyright law. Examinations require special locations, as noted previously, and may have to be made up in multiple and alternative versions, one of which will always have to be withheld for later use as a make-up. (No class of five hundred plus can ever all be gathered together at once for anything; there will always be people ill, absent on university-sponsored activities, and so forth.) The secretary who can effortlessly get thirty five copies of a five question essay test out for you on an hour's notice cannot, no matter how willing, type, proofread, run off, and collate five hundred copies in that time. (It takes my four person team four hours to collate 1100 exams utilizing two manual collators and electric staplers. One can use automatic collators but those I am familiar with are too erratic to be useful for examinations.) Films for class use must be ordered well ahead of time and for specific dates, times, and locations. This means that the class and examination schedule and coverage become almost inflexible. That, in turn, requires that I stay on schedule, which demands yet further planning and coordination than most of us are used to.

If one utilizes discussion sections, an entire new area of organization opens up. Teaching assistants must be trained, individually supervised, and met regularly as a group. Their efforts and activites, including their class assignments and testing, must be coordinated with lecture, reading, and course homework assignments developed with appropriate grading, and so forth. And finally, of course, at the end of the term, the whole great orchestration must be neatly tied up without one loose end and without ideosyncratic results that would justify that terrible undergraduate bugaboo, "unfairness."

It is apparent from the discussion above that the problem of time is inextricably interwoven with that of organization. In the mass class, there

are in essence three kinds of time to be considered: the quantity available to the instructor, TA, and student; the schedule, which needs to be pre-planned to the last detail, and lead-time. It is not enough to know before the term begins exactly what one will be doing in every class hour for the entire semester (and/or what one will do if a planned activity such as a film is aborted by events). It is also necessary to know how long beforehand things must be put into motion in order to be able to do something at some specific time in the future. Films, slides and so forth are probably best ordered a full semester in advance--you may not get them otherwise. Test drafts may have to be in secretarial hands three weeks before the exam is to be given. Special room orders, in particular those for examinations, may need to be made before the semester begins. The university calendar (holidays, last dates for dropping courses, etc.) needs to be articulated with your own; it is bad policy, for example, to give the second of three term exams after the last date to drop the course without grade.

Problems of and for the Instructor

Certain kinds of problems of the mass class seem to me to be generic to the nature of such classes themselves, others are experienced by the students of such classes, yet others will be known only to their instructors.

In general, I think it fair to say that mass class teaching is unlike any other kind of instruction. Thus I do not believe that any real training for it is possible except through apprenticeship, experience, and, perhaps, the stage. (I will return to the latter idea later.) It seems to be generally agreed among academic people that even at its best mass instruction is inferior to good small class instruction, although it should be noted that there is no evidence to support the notion that small class instruction is inherently good. One thing is clear: mass classes should never be assigned to, or attempted by, inexperienced teachers. One can gain experience at mass teaching only by doing it, but to ask that it be done by someone with little teaching experience of any kind is insane. Further, in my experience, doing mass teaching properly is a full-time job. One class of five hundred students or more is a full teaching load. To behave otherwise is unfair both to instructor and students. Finally, it takes at least one full year, and may require more, to systematize the activity in mass teaching a particular course. If one is being experimented with, the results should probably not be evaluated for at least two.

Two of the student problems in mass courses were mentioned in the introduction to this paper: students will feel anonymous, like ciphers, in the course, and will experience a great deal of social distance between themselves and the lecturer. (They may become quite close, on the other hand, to their teaching assistant. Perhaps it is this phenomenon that is responsible for the myth that graduate students are better teachers than more senior faculty.) Mass courses are also especially hard on the academically ill-prepared student and those without much motivation for academic achievement, and it may be this which sometimes gives them the reputation of "flunk-out" courses. Even when such a class is systematically organized to identify early and attempt to salvage students with academic problems, the failure and drop-out rate for the mass class is extraordinary. It can be disguised only by chicanery with the grade system.

The mass class is also, and inevitably, to some degree mechanical. Special treatment for special student cases is difficult, sometimes impossible. The exception that may be made for one student in a class of thirty cannot be made for thirty-three with the same problem in the class of one thousand. Extra-credit activity is difficult to reward with equity; objective testing is almost an absolute requirement and some kind of machine--or at least mechanized--scoring is usually essential. And perhaps above all, the inflexible demands of schedule reduce flexibility and opportunities for student creativity.

These phenomena are reasonably well known. One that I have never seen addressed in the literature, however, is also important, a matter of the psychology of the student in the mass course. That is that the student member of such a course does not experience participation in a class; he or she is not psychologically a member of a class, but of an audience. Almost everything about the mass course works to produce this phenomenon: the rooms it meets in, the rigid, advance timing of the schedule, the social distance between instructor and student. This, it seems to me, encourages students to take a passive attitude toward the classroom experience. Unconsciously they expect something to be done to them, not that they are expected to do something or contribute themselves. The responsibility for learning is transfered from self to instructor or instructional context. This phenomenon, if in fact operating, (I am convinced it does), may be even more exaggerated for our present cohorts of students with their immense past exposure to television.

The phenomenon also sets up very high student expectations for instructor performance. The teacher of the mass class does not compete for student appraisal with other teachers or normal classes; he or she is in unconscious subjective competition in student minds with Sesame Street and Johnny Carson. Such expectations can be met, of course, only with the resources of NBC or PBS. The failure to meet them has consequences for the instructor in the form of an unfortunate Pygmalion Effect: inevitably the instructor will learn from student cues and course evaluations that he or she is a failure. Few college courses, even if designed to be "crowd pleasers," with all of the problems that entails, can successfully compete with the commercial entertainment with which the mass class is subjectively compared by its student members. But unaware of the fallacious basis for their judgments, the students experience their reactions to the class as the consequence of an instructional failure. It is also possible that this is exaggerated by philosophies of lower education which have trained students to believe that all learning experiences should be entertaining to be useful or valid.

The instructor of the mass class, then, may expect to experience an emotional beating. Most of his or her previous teaching experience will be irrelevant or, at best, peripheral to mass teaching problems. The usual cues we all learn in normal teaching to tell us "where the class is at" do not work in the mass situation: little eye-to-eye contact is possible, shifts of facial expression go unseen, and the cues of posture are too varied to be read. One will do the task badly for the first semester or two and even after that, one will not be able to perform at the level one has learned to consider satisfactory in smaller classes. One will have little contact with any students except the problem cases and the majority of student feedback received will indicate varying levels of dissatisfaction.

GROPING TOWARD THEORY

Despite the indictment drawn above, I am not convinced that the problems described are all inevitable. I believe, rather, that most result from our failure to develop an appropriate theoretical model for mass class teaching. Judged by the model of the normal classroom and its teaching, mass instruction will probably always result in some degree of failure. But that model, and the kinds and techniques of judgment appropriate to it, are theoretically inappropriate to the mass class. It seems to me that we need research on such classes guided by the elementary sociological observation that, as indicated earlier, such "classes" are not classes in the usual sense at all, but audiences.

The reason the distinction is important is obvious once the matter is pointed out. A class, as that term is normally used, is a social group. It is bounded and its members interact over time on the basis of shared norms and role expectations. But an audience is a collective behavior phenomenon, a conventional crowd. It has only minimal social organization and there is little social interaction among its members. Thus we should not expect to work effectively instructional techniques that presume group social organization among the persons to whom they are directed. We all know that the best classroom instruction of the usual kind utilizes instructors and students interacting together, i.e., as a group, to accomplish some task of cognition. We should not expect such phenomena to occur between performer and audience.

I suggest, then, that if we are to utilize mass instruction effectively, we must recognize the audience characteristic of the class, and use it to advantage. So far as I know, however, there is no educational theory that addresses this problem, and the only available models we have for it must be drawn from the theater. Exotic as that suggestion may sound at first proposal, there seems to me to be a lot to be said for it. The theatrical tradition is ancient, far older, in fact, than universities, and any student of theater knows a variety of established technique through which audiences can be moved, influenced, even taught and made to think. What may be needed, then, is serious, systematic collaboration between sociologist and student of theater to devise appropriate means of instruction. I have not myself pursued this suggestion, but am convinced of the possibility of its fruitfullness.

ADVISE AND SUGGESTIONS

I should like to close this memorandum with two sets of suggestions, observations, and advices, addressed to departments which use or may be considering the use of mass instruction, and to faculty members who may be asked to perform it. Some are factual, based in experience; some are opinion, similarly based. They have not been seriously disputed by the few mass class teachers with whom I have discussed them.

To Departments

The mass class is cost-effective. It can be done satisfactorily, if not well, if it is taken seriously as an instructional task and done under realistic expectations and understandings. Many of these are different from those that would be appropriate for other kinds of teaching.

Mass instruction permits the exposure of your best and most experienced people to your largest student audiences aided by the most sophisticated auxilliary devices. It also provides an unparalleled opportunity for training your graduate students to teach.

Mass instruction should probably be attempted only by full professors for whom it should be a full teaching load. There should be departmentally-devised objectives for the courses so-taught, and the department should have procedures for ascertaining whether they are attained. If it is the introductory course, (the most likely), it is the class most important for determining the department's future and should be treated as a significant resource. If its instruction is found to be unsatisfactory, it should be altered.

The instructor of the course should be rotated out of the assignment, or temporarily relieved, after six or eight semesters, and instruction should never, under any circumstances, be assigned to graduate students or assistant professors...or to associates unless the department wishes to deny them further promotion.

To Instructors

Teaching mass classes is unlike any other kind of teaching. No one will do it well the first time and there can be no experiential preparation for it except teaching itself and, perhaps, theater. Do not accept such an assignment if you are untenured and, if tenured, don't accept it for long if you have ambitions for promotion. Be prepared to do it badly, and know that you are doing it badly, for at least two semesters, and never, if you take your teaching seriously, to be satisfied with your own performance.

Doing it well requires a degree of showmanship. You will be competing with Saturday Night Live. A mass class does not have students, it has an audience. There is nothing to be done about this phenomenon except to utilize it.

Do not do it unless you truly enjoy students and teaching. Remind yourself constantly that the majority of the students in your course are <u>not</u> the goof-offs, screw-ups, screwballs, manipulators and neurotics that you see in your office. You get a select group; the good ones that are doing the job and getting along satisfactorily will not usually be among them.

Do not do it without an adequate lecture room (you probably won't get a good one), or without adequate clerical assistance, equipment, and supplies.

You must be <u>organized</u> to do it well. No one can teach a mass class off the cuff or from notes scribbled on a 3x5 card ten minutes before lecture. Lead-time is your most precious commodity and you should know before the term begins exactly what you will be doing every class hour--and what you will do when you can't do what you've planned.

Get commitments, in writing, from your department head and dean about TAs, support funds, time off, evaluation, etc., and be prepared to quit the course when they are not kept.

Do not plan to teach a mass course for more than three or four years without a significant break because, if you are a dedicated teacher, its problems will break your heart if confronted without relief.

Notes

1. For a survey of the use of mass instruction in sociology departments, and the perceived problems encountered with it, see Paul J. Baker, "Mass Instruction in Sociology: On The Domestication of a Pedagogical Monster," Teaching Sociology, 4:1, October 1976, pp. 5-28, and Paul J. Baker and Patricia J. Behrens, "Alternatives to Mass Instruction," American Sociologist, 6:4, November 1971, pp. 311-317.

2. See Paul J. Baker, "Social Awareness Project," Teaching Sociology, 3:1 October 1975, pp. 74-80; William V. D'Antonio, "Teaching Sociology: An Impossible Dream?" section on Undergraduate Education, American Sociological Association, 1978, Teaching Resource Center, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.; Everett K. Wilson, "Inductive Methods in Teaching Sociology," in Mark M. Krug, et al., The New Social Studies: Analysis of Materials and Theory, Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock, 1970, pp. 113-120; and Everett K. Wilson, "Sociology: Discipline or Profession?" Section on Undergraduate Education, American Sociological Association, 1977, Teaching Resource Center, American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.